

REMARKS

Reconsideration and further prosecution of the above-identified application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and the discussion that follows. Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 11, 15 and 17 have been amended herein for the purpose of clarification. Claim 15 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as directed to a propagated carrier signal. Claims 4-7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraphs as not enabled and unclear. Claims 1-4, 6, 8-13, and 15-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,978,247 to Bogart et al. ("Bogart"). Claims 5, 7, 14 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bogart in view of Sonesh, et al. ("Sonesh") (U.S. Patent No. 6,046,762). After a careful review of the claims as amended, it is believed that the claims are in allowable form and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.


Claim 15 has been rejected as directed to a propagated carrier signal. Claim 15 has been amended to clarify that the software is tangibly embodied in a propagated carrier and thus is tangibly embodied in the carrier. Therefore, claim 15 is believed to be in allowable form. In addition, claims 4-7 were rejected as not enabled by the specification, and as being indefinite. Claims 4 and 5 have been amended for clarification and are supported in the specification, for example, at p. 8, 2nd paragraph and p. 13-14. Thus, claim 4-7 are now believed to be in allowable form.

Claims 1-4, 6, 8-13, and 15-19 have been rejected as being anticipated by Bogart. Bogart is directed to a multi media customer care center divided into three separate application layers. The independent claim 1, 8 and 15 have been amended to clarify that the bandwidth requirement is estimated and used in selecting the media handler (see e.g., p. 14, top paragraph). This feature is not disclosed by Bogart or Sonesch. Therefore, all independent claims 1, 8 and 15 are believed

to distinguish over any combination of Bogart and Sonesh as are claims 2-7, 9-14 and 16-20 which are dependent upon allowable independent claims 1, 8 and 15.

As discussed above, claims 1-20 are in allowable form and are not anticipated or rendered obvious by any combination of the cited references. Therefore, allowance of all pending claims 1-20 is believed to be in order and such action is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of the subject application, he is respectfully requested to telephone applicant's undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,


James A. Scheer
Reg. No. 29,434

Dated: January 8, 2007

WELSH & KATZ, LTD
120 South Riverside Plaza, 22nd Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 655-1500 Telephone
(312) 655-1501 Facsimile